

Maybe We Ought To Bomb Saigon Instead of North Vietnam

"Saigon is a special problem. . . . You can buy almost anything you want on the black market, cigarettes, liquor, almost any item the Americans ship over here. How the supplies get from the U.S. military outlets to the black market's stalls seems to be one of the mysteries of Saigon. Nobody wants to talk about it. Observation by a U.S. offi-

cial: 'We could knock a lot of the wind out of the Viet Cong by throwing a really tight blockade around Saigon . . . it's a big supply center for the Communists. We hold it. We run it. But they can get anything they want on the black market here: medicine, clothing, food, flame-throwers—you name it.'"

—White House Correspondent John P. Sutherland, on a visit to Vietnam, in U.S. News & World Report, April 4.

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XIV, NO. 13

APRIL 4, 1966



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Jeffersonianism for Export Only

It is good to know that a committee of the House of Representatives has been privately investigating secret police practices. And that, in the course of its inquiry, it has now reported on the methods used for the surveillance of travellers. "Everybody who enters . . . as a tourist, businessman, or official delegate," it is disclosed in a report this committee made March 17, "falls under control of XXX agents, surveillance, telephone monitoring, hidden microphones, letter censorship, etc." These official disclosures are given additional weight because they appeared in the first report ever published by a 10-year old House Armed Services subcommittee whose very existence has been unpublicized until now. It is a subcommittee on the CIA.

The Mote In Our Own Electronic Eye

Lest we raise the hopes of our readers too high, we hasten to add that the report did not deal with the surveillance by U.S. Embassies of Americans travelling abroad. The XXX agency in the quotation above was neither the CIA nor the FBI but another three-letter spy agency, the AVH, of Hungary, the country the report dealt with. But the mentality and methods are so similar that we hope some time a committee of Congress, especially one supposed to exercise surveillance (if the CIA will pardon the expression) over one of our own secret police agencies may turn its attention to the methods used by our government to shadow Americans travelling abroad and foreigners travelling here. The witness in the Hungarian report, a former AVH-man named Laszlo Szabo, defected after shameful experience opened his eyes to the evils of a system relying for security on a secret police network which shadows those suspected of being in disagreement with it. Some day a U.S. secret police agent, taught by his experiences to see the virtues of a free and open society without listening devices, may defect here and be willing to tell his story, if like Mr. Szabo he were promised asylum. We wonder whether, among the thousands of men in our own vast underground of intelligence agencies, a Congressional committee could not find one or two disillusioned agents closer home than Budapest if it were really interested.

It is no accident that Congressional committees save their indignation over secret police practices to those which take place 5,000 miles away. We take for granted at home the

Snooperly Unlimited

Q. You said that this [surveillance of U.S. citizens abroad] has been a practice for 30 years. . . . Is there any legal authority for it?

A. I frankly can't answer that. . . .

Q. There are an awful lot of investigative agencies in this town. Does this policy mean that any investigative agency can forward an inquiry to the State Department and that inquiry can be then used as a check on any American citizen abroad to institute a check on his activities abroad?

A. In this present context, the answer to that I would presume to be yes. . . .

Q. Well, are there any standards, any objective standards, as distinguished from opinions held perhaps by individual officials as to what would constitute a proper frame of reference for decisions to send such a report abroad, or should it be assumed that all American citizens who travel abroad may be subjected to surveillance on the decisions of some secret agency within the Government?

A. I don't think that there is an absolute criterion that could be applied.

—Press Conference, State Dept., March 24 with Assistant Secretary Robert J. McCloskey.

Big Brotherism we deplore on the other side. We think it dreadful that men should be penalized there on mere suspicion of pro-capitalist leanings. But it is amazing how many here take it for granted that when Harvard Professor H. Stuart Hughes, the distinguished grandson of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, goes abroad he should be shadowed because (in the fractured English of our semi-literate sleuths) he "reportedly in the past has had strong convictions toward Communism." Precisely what this gibberish means must be left to the FBI man who wrote it and the State Department officials who forwarded it to U.S. Embassies. But even so normally civilized a conservative paper as the *Washington Evening Star* defends its propriety. "This sort of surveillance of citizens is necessarily maintained in the United States," it said in an editorial March 28, "and the fact that a citizen may be travelling abroad should not confer a special immunity on him." Our country has drifted very far from its free beginnings when a leading newspaper unblushingly asserts that such

(Continued on Page Four)

Role of the Poor Ignored by House Education and Labor Committee

Not One Representative of the Poor at This Year's Poverty Hearings

By Peter Osnos

In the House Education and Labor Committee hearings on the first full year of the poverty program, the role of the poor in developing local programs was all but ignored. "Maximum feasible participation" was supposed to be a basic precept of the program, but not one representative of the poor was invited to appear. The testimony of non-controversial Negro ministers and the Executive Director of the National Council of Negro Women were offered as substitutes. For most of the eight sessions, the committee was treated to optimistic reports from Administration officials and, among others, the President of Litton Industries, the Chairman of the Board of General Electric, the Chairman of the Board of the Hotel Corporation of America and Arkansas Governor Orval Faubus. By way of contrast, witnesses last year included the Rev. Lynward Stevenson of Saul Alinsky's Woodlawn project; Cecil Moore, the militant leader of the Philadelphia NAACP and Martin Luther King. Statements by Tom Hayden of the Students for a Democratic Society and by several other radicals were accepted for the record.

More Powell Demagoguery

At Chairman Adam Clayton Powell's direction, the focus of this year's hearings was unemployment. "Many of the cultural and social frills of the war on poverty should be cut out," Powell told the Office of Economic Opportunity in January, "All we need are jobs, just jobs." To Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz, Powell said, "Manpower programs have no excuse for dragging their heels and idly contemplating their research navels while the poor stay unemployed." Job training and placement are, obviously of the utmost importance. On the other hand, Powell, who missed many of the hearings, should not have waited until they were over to reaffirm his commitment to "maximum feasible participation." His threat to scuttle the poverty war if Mayors are given veto powers over local programs (UPI Audio, March 27) seems like a belated bit of demagoguery.

OEO contends discussion of "maximum feasible participa-

Where LBJ Economizes

"We are especially distressed by the substantial cuts in various education program budgets submitted by the Administration. . . . The proposed cuts in (the impacted areas school aid program) very nearly offset the increased aid to education provided by the 1965 elementary and secondary education bill. . . . We hope the committee will appropriate sufficient funds to meet at least the present authorizations for vocational education. The 1967 budget requests some \$69 million less than the amounts authorized. This is yet another contrast between promise and performance."

—Andrew J. Biemiller on behalf of AFL-CIO to the House Appropriations Committee, March 24.

tion" is no longer necessary. "It is an accomplished fact," said one OEO official. Statistics proudly displayed at OEO show several thousand poor people serving on local poverty boards. The statistics don't show, however, that in many cities, including Chicago and Los Angeles, the poor continue to be denied any authority.

The real reason for soft-pedaling "maximum feasible participation," OEO staffers and Congressional aides privately admit, is that "there are many members of the committee who don't particularly care for the concept. Many of them would like to see it out of the bill altogether." Even some committee liberals have expressed concern over the impact a well-organized poor could have on the status quo in their districts.

The Community Action Programs—once described as the "prime offensive in the war on poverty"—are bound to suffer as a result of the attitude of OEO and Congress. The essence of the CAPs is full participation of the poor in activities ranging from rent strikes to caring for the elderly. Although 650 CAPs are now in operation, barely 10% of the nation's 32 million poor have been reached. In spite of this, OEO has recommended that program development funds—the "seed money" used by local agencies to organize community action programs—be cut from \$18 million to \$6 million. The CAPs are in danger of strangulation. The politicians fear the poor.

Insights at Random: How Johnson Tried to Put The "Kosher" Stamp on the Viet War

"Hechscher" is the seal which certifies that meats are kosher. Johnson sought the seal on the Vietnamese war by secret talks in Bangkok with certain Israeli representatives. The idea was for Israeli soldier-advisers to help the South Vietnamese military develop "Nahal" fighter-settler colonies like those in Israel. The idea was nonsense since the Nahal were imbued with tremendous zeal in a struggle for national rebirth and survival. No military dictatorship, especially an Asian one wholly dependent on a white imperial power, could hope to generate such elan. But it would have been a great publicity stunt for Johnson and the war. Fortunately it leaked to Milton Friedman of Jewish Telegraphic Agency in Washington. His stories created a storm in Israel and the Israeli government had to deny any such intention. . . . Even in West Germany, participating in the Viet war is unpopular; more than 90% voted against it in a German public opinion poll. . . . What Owen Lattimore said at Pembroke College, Providence, March 28, applies to the whole range of CIA operations, "we know everything that happens in China but not a thing that's going on." Our preconceptions undo all our expensive operations. Even the

latest electronic gear is no substitute for an objective and sympathetic mind. . . . Three interlocking fears play their part in the NATO discussions. One, highly advertised, but dwindling, is fear of Russia. Another, less spoken of in public but growing, is fear of Germany. The third, which our other allies are too polite to mention, but French Premier Pompidou touched on in a TV interview March 28, is fear of being drawn into a thermonuclear war by U.S. recklessness. . . . The big vote for the ex-dictator Rojas Pinilla in the Colombian elections may serve as a reminder that "democracy" as it is known and practiced in most Latin American countries is a game played out within the oligarchy by conventional propertied class parties with no real concern for the masses. As in ancient Rome, Caesars like Peron and Rojas Pinilla appeal over the heads of the oligarchic Republican Patricians to the proletariat, offering them bread and circuses in return for giving up liberties that had little real meaning for them anyway. That way is the road to corruption and degeneracy but it can only be countered by meaningful social politics or by social revolution.

How Senator Long and Wm. S. White Distorted the the Dominican Revolution

Now We Have "Instant" Myths As Well As "Instant" Coffee

In the ancient world, myths developed over the centuries. In the modern world, they can spring up overnight. Here is an example, from last week's Congressional Record, dealing with the Dominican Republic. We begin with this from a speech on the floor of the Senate March 25:

Mr. Long of Louisiana. In yesterday's Washington Post, Wm. S. White presents the final proof of the part played by the Communists in the violent upheaval in the Dominican Republic last year. He does it by the simple but effective method of quoting from the boasts now being published in the organs of the international communist movement. Two members of the executive committee of the Dominican Communist Party, writing in the magazine *World Marxist Review* . . . are blatantly proclaiming their responsibility for the uprising and . . . one of the most brazen and important tactics they disclosed was their allocation of their armed Communists throughout the commands involved in the rebellion—as soon as they discovered that their concentration made them a target for our criticism.

This embellished on what Mr. White wrote. In the column, as inserted in the Record, by Senator Long, all the columnist said on this point was:

Though the Communists were not able at its start fully to control the uprising they shortly were "allocating armed Communists" to revolutionary commands organized block by block in Santo Domingo. . . . Quelle and Conde write . . . "At first we combined all our forces in a single command. The fallacy of this decision soon made itself felt. It restricted, on the one hand our own propaganda (which was conducted chiefly among our own members). On the other hand this command became the target for attack on the movement by the imperialists. Having realized our mistake, we thereupon allocated armed Communists to a number of commands."

But if White had given the rest of that paragraph it would be seen that this was not a device to control the revolt but to break out of isolation. The two Communists wrote (January 1966, *World Marxist Review*, p. 53) —

We succeeded, as a result, in making our line known to the armed forces, to the majority of the participants of the movement who did not belong to any party, winning their sympathy and ensuring the steady growth of our Party and the strengthening of the popular resistance as a whole.*

Indeed if Senator Long and Mr. White had read the first installment of this two-part article in the December issue of the same review, they would have found the two Communist leaders admitting that far from starting the revolution, it caught them by surprise. Senator Clark (D., Pa.) put the first installment in the Record along with the White column, to let the Senate judge the distortions for itself:

Mr. Clark. . . Mr. White chortles that in the article the

* The only "block by block" control was exercised, according to these two Communist writers, not by the armed Communists but by "so-called 'commandos'" which "were organized for the defense of the city. These were military-political bodies organized at the height of the struggle by political parties, trade unions and other popular organizations in the various districts, streets, and separate buildings, and acting within their particular zone as organs of executive power. This was a new and original form of people's power. Headed by those who displayed the most courage and organizational ability and courage in the fighting, the 'commandos' represented a wide cross-section of the population, including soldiers and civilians, workers and students, intellectuals and unemployed."

—P. 6425, *Con. Rec.* March 25.

Goldberg "Reversed" by Anthony Eden

"Mr. Arthur Goldberg is reported as saying to a press conference in London, 'One of the U.S. objections to the Geneva settlement was that the United Nations had not been given a larger role. The U.S. government felt the UN should have been asked to supervise the elections.' To the best of my recollection no such criticism was ever voiced by any U.S. representative at Geneva at any time during the four months which the Conference lasted. It would indeed have been surprising if it had, since a reason why the UN could not be more closely associated with the Geneva Conference was that a principal member of the Conference, China, was not a member of the UN. The leadership in resisting China's membership was then being taken by the United States. So far as I know that is still the position. It would be a pity if confusion about the past were to add to the already sufficient difficulties in finding a solution to the Vietnam war."

Lord Avon (Anthony Eden)

—Letter in *The Times* (London) March 16.

Communists not only acknowledge but boast of their "deep and armed complicity" in the Dominican revolt of April, 1965. Thereby, says Mr. White, the Communists themselves have destroyed the case of the critics of the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic. . . . [But] in the first place the article makes it clear that the Dominican Communists had nothing to do with organizing or inspiring the April revolution. Indeed, the authors of the article indulge in rather severe self-criticism for having been caught napping. "We failed to see," they write, that an armed uprising was inevitable. Consequently our party found itself unprepared for the uprising and was unable to head it, although as far as possible it took a firm and resolute part in it." . . . The article also confirms, as critics of the Administration have maintained—that the Communists at no point controlled the revolution. It even criticizes leadership of the revolution as being "rightist."

Senator Clark called attention particularly to the fact that the article reports that the rebels were initially confused as to the object of the U.S. intervention. It says:

Many actually believed that the Americans had landed for the purpose of protecting the people from Wessin's air attacks, or to insure the return of Bosch.

"One may note here," Senator Clark commented, "the great depth of good will toward the U.S. in the Dominican Republic and the propaganda weapon which the intervention handed the Communists."

But of those who read Mr. White's syndicated column not one in 10,000 will see Senator Clark's rebuttal in the *Congressional Record* or the *Weekly*. The truth will never catch up to the myth.

A similarly distorted use of the *Marxist Review* articles was made by Selden (D., Ala.), chairman of the House subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. He put into the Record on March 23 a *Los Angeles Times* column by Ernest Conine, "Now the Reds Confirm Dominican Revolt Role." We are a little surprised at the wide circulation given this rather obscure Communist journal. We do not wish to do injustice to the erudition of Long, White, Selden and Conine, and it may be that they are more omnivorous readers than we give them credit for. But the CIA, which monitors such journals, has been known to leak stuff this way before.

Revelations in the Staughton Lynd Passport Case The Press Blacked Out

(Continued from Page One)

police state practices are normal at home in order to defend the shadowing of citizens abroad! Merely because he is travelling abroad, as the *Evening Star* says, "should not confer a special immunity on him." This is exactly how Communist regimes defend the surveillance of those citizens they allow abroad.

The Only Free People Not Free To Travel

We are getting to be like one of those poor countries whose best products are reserved for export only. Congress and most of the press can be rallied with Jeffersonian passion against restrictions on the civil liberties of Hungarians. But at home our bureaucrats can make *goulasch* of the Bill of Rights without noticeable effect on Congressional blood pressure. Only one Senator, Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts, has protested the orders to snoop on Prof. Hughes, and in a sharp letter to Secretary Rusk posed a series of questions on the practice of shadowing U.S. citizens in foreign countries. We wait to see what kind of answer it elicits. At his press conference last Friday Secretary Rusk, that pillar of uncompromising resistance to totalitarian practices from Smolensk to Haiphong, would only say under questioning, "I'm not satisfied that our present procedures are exactly what they ought to be." Our Secretary of State's utterances are in no danger of being confused with Voltaire's. The Rusk remark was a gem of tepid ambiguity. But even the little bloc of liberals in Congress has yet to introduce a bill to safeguard the right to travel, a bill to pull down the McCarran-Walter wall which denies visas to foreign visitors with radical records and dismantle the little Iron Curtains the State Department imposes on countries like Cuba whose government it dislikes. Americans remain the only people of the "free world" not free to travel where they please. In this we are more Muscovite than Anglo-Saxon.

Where the victim of bureaucratic practices is an oppositionist (as they say in Moscow), the press shows itself almost as queasy as it was in the days of McCarthy. Nobody asked Secretary Rusk about the new revelations in the Staughton Lynd passport case though these were disclosed to the press the day

Dangerous To Let Christians Travel

"The U.S. should lift its trade embargo on Cuba and re-evaluate its policies toward that country, the Rev. J. Hugh Anwyl said here yesterday. He recently visited Cuba. The Rev. Anwyl, pastor of Mt. Hollywood Congregational Church, Hollywood, Calif., said the political climate was changing in Cuba and the U.S. should act to improve relations. 'Premier Castro is re-evaluating his policy toward China and I imagine he would do the same thing regarding Russia,' the Rev. Anwyl said. 'He is concerned that he does not become dependent on any country. I think Cuba represents a microcosm of the confrontation between Christianity and Communism and I feel the way to meet the challenge is not to present Christianity behind battleships or trade embargoes.' The Rev. Anwyl was here to speak at a meeting of the executive council of the United Church of Christ. He spent a week in Cuba at the suggestion of his congregation to 'express our concern' over conditions that ministers endure there. He is from Wales and a British subject. . . . Rev. Anwyl said he had been scheduled to participate in Easter services at the Hollywood Bowl but after he returned from Cuba and made statements about re-evaluating the U.S. position he had been informed that he was no longer scheduled to appear at the services."

—St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 15.

before after a closed hearing at the State Department. His counsel, David Carliner, acting for the American Civil Liberties Union, said he elicited admissions from Passport Office officials that they had sent an "investigator" to listen in on Professor Lynd's talk here to Women Strike for Peace and take note, in their language, of any "anti-American remarks." A Passport Office attorney admitted that his passport was revoked not just for visiting North Vietnam in defiance of our Iron Curtain regulations but for the kind of speeches he made on his return. Though the *AP* put Carliner's disclosures on its wires, no metropolitan paper that I saw except the *Washington Post* two days later carried the story. This silence can only be attributed to the fact that Lynd is not considered respectable enough to qualify for full enjoyment of those basic liberties we so yearn to confer on the poor Hungarians.

Index for 1965 Ready — Send Stamped Addressed Envelope — Renew Your Sub and Send A Gift Sub at the Same Time

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name

Street

City Zone State

4/4/66

For the enclosed \$5 send a gift sub to:

(To) Name

Street

City Zone State

For \$5.35 extra send I. F. Stone's *The Haunted Fifties*
Indicate if announcement wished ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class
postage paid
at
Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except in August, the last week in December and the first week in January and Bi-Weekly during July at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N.W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: \$5 in the U.S.; \$6 in Canada; \$10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: \$15 to Europe; \$20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.